

REMARKS

This paper is responsive to the Office Action mailed April 10, 2008. Claims 1-16 were pending before submission of this paper. Claims 1-16 stand rejected. Claims 1, 7, 8, 10, 11, 13, 14 and 16 have been amended. Claims 5 and 6 are canceled. Claims 1-4 and 7-16 are currently pending. Support for all amended claims can be found in the specification, and no new matter has been added by these amendments. Reconsideration of the claims in view of the amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102 and §103

Claims 1-4 and 7-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 7,200,644 issued to *Flanagan*. Claims 5 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Flanagan* in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,665,721 issued to *Hind*. Without conceding the merits of the rejection, Applicants respectfully submit that the amended claims overcome the rejections.

Claim 1 has been amended to include the limitations of claims 5 and 6 (now canceled). Claim 1, as amended, recites:

A storage-device controlling apparatus in a storage system, comprising:
a file system for receiving a data input/output request on file-name specification basis, and executing the input/output of data with respect to a storage device included in the file system in response to said data input/output request, said data input/output request being transmitted from an information processing apparatus connected to the storage-device controlling apparatus via a network;
a processing device operative to perform steps of:
receiving a proxy request for substitute-executing the download of a file from a Web server on the Internet, said proxy request being transmitted from the information processing apparatus based on HTTP protocol via said network;
establishing a connection with the Internet;
downloading said file from said Web server in response to said proxy request; and
storing said downloaded file into said storage device via said file system;
and
a processing queue for storing a plurality of proxy requests therein,
wherein said processing device is operative to perform a step of modifying an order of processing of the proxy requests that have been registered in said processing queue,

wherein a condition for starting a processing for each proxy request is stored on a proxy request basis, processing of the proxy requests being started based on said condition.

As described in claim 1, a condition is established for each proxy request. The processing sequence of the proxy requests is changed in accordance with the condition. The execution of each proxy request begins after the corresponding condition is met.

Flanagan discloses when a user terminal with a proxy browser sends a web server a request to download data stored on the web server to a device on the Internet, the data stored on the web server is downloaded to the device by the web server. (See col. 8, lines 53-64).

Hind discloses conversion of expressions of a proxy request (e.g., into XML representations). (See col. 4, lines 30-41). *Hind* also discloses that an inbound request to the Internet must wait for an inbound request from a reverse proxy so that the request can be converted. (See col. 4, lines 29-32).

Neither *Flanagan*, *Hind* nor any of the other cited references, alone or in combination, teach all of the features recited in independent claim 1. Specifically, *Flanagan* and *Hind* do not teach "a processing queue for storing a plurality of proxy requests therein, wherein said processing device is operative to perform a step of modifying an order of processing of the proxy requests that have been registered in said processing queue, wherein a condition for starting a processing for each proxy request is stored on a proxy request basis, processing of the proxy requests being started based on said condition," as recited in claim 1. For at least this reason, claim 1 is allowable over the cited art.

Independent claims 7 and 13, as amended, recite features that are similar to the features recited in amended claim 1. As discussed above with reference to claim 1, the cited art does not teach these features. Thus, claims 7 and 13 are also allowable over the cited art for at least the same reasons.

Claims 2-4 are dependent on claim 1, claims 8-12 are dependent on claim 7, and claims 14-16 are dependent on claim 13. As discussed above, claims 1, 7 and 13 are allowable over the cited art. Thus, claims 2-4, 8-12 and 14-16 are also patentable for the reasons discussed above with respect to claims 1, 7 and 13, as well as on their own merits.

Claims 5 and 6 have been canceled rendering the rejection of these claims moot.

Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-16 under 135 U.S.C. §102(e) and §103(a) is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe all claims now pending in this application are in condition for allowance and an action to that end is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 206-467-9600.

Respectfully submitted,

/John J. Farrell/

John J. Farrell
Reg. No. 57,291

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-3834
Tel: 206-467-9600
Fax: 415-576-0300
JJF:kbh
61425784 v2